

REMARKS**Status of the Claims**

Claims 1, 8, and 14 are currently present in the Application, and each are independent claims that have been amended in this Amendment. Claims 5, 12, 18, and 21-23 have been canceled in this Amendment. Applicants are not conceding in this Application that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the remaining claims. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuation and/or divisional patent applications.

In particular, Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to include limitations previously found in dependent claims 5 and 21. Similarly, Applicants have amended independent claim 8 to include limitations previously found in dependent claims 12 and 22 and have amended independent claim 14 to include limitations previously found in dependent claims 18 and 23. Applicants have therefore canceled claims 5, 12, 18, and 21-23 in this Amendment.

Claim Rejections - Alleged Anticipation Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 8, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being obvious, and therefore unpatentable, over U.S. Patent Pub. 2002/0085579 by Sullivan et al. (hereinafter "Sullivan") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,330,710 to O'Neil et al. (hereinafter "O'Neil"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

As currently amended, each of the independent claims are directed at a redirection web server that provides a home page identifier to a client computing device. Taking claim 1 as an exemplary independent claim, the limitations found in each of the amended independent claims include:

- receiving, over a computer network, at a redirection web site, a home page request from the client computing device, the home page request including a user identifier that identifies a user of the client device, one or more client network connection identifiers, and a client current

timestamp corresponding to a timestamp at the client computing device, wherein the redirection web site performs the steps including:

- obtaining the client current timestamp from the received homepage request;
- obtaining, from the received home page request, the one or more network connection identifiers that identify one or more computer networks to which the client computing device is currently connected;
- retrieving, from a nonvolatile storage device, the home page identifier , wherein the retrieving further comprises:
 - selecting, from the nonvolatile storage device, one or more records that correspond to the user identifier, wherein the one or more records that correspond to the user are arranged in a home page table that corresponds to the user, wherein the home page table includes a plurality of entries, and wherein each entry includes a network identifier field, a day of the week field, a time range field, and an address field, and wherein the nonvolatile storage device includes records for a plurality of user identifiers;
 - identifying, from the group of selected records, the home page identifier based upon the obtained timestamp and the obtained network connection identifiers, wherein the identifying includes selecting one of the entries by matching the obtained timestamp with the day of the week field and the time range field and by matching the obtained one or more network connection identifiers with the network identifier field; and
 - acquiring the identified home page identifier from the address field of the selected entry;

- redirecting the browser executing on the client computing device to the retrieved home page identifier;
- ⊖ setting a browser's home page to the retrieved home page identifier, and
- repeatedly re-performing, by the redirection web site, the obtaining of the client current timestamp, the obtaining of the one or more network connection identifiers, the retrieving of the home page identifier, and the redirecting of the browser at predetermined time intervals.

Each of Applicants' independent claims is directed at using a "redirection web site" that determines the home page for a client computing device based upon the current timestamp as well as the client's current network connections. During the Examiner Interview of April 9, 2008, Supervisory Examiner Lin agreed that Sullivan does not teach using a "redirection web site" but instead uses a "registry server" that provides different functionality. This different functionality is set forth in Applicants' independent claims and is distinguished from the teachings of Sullivan and O'Neil. Specifically, by using the timestamp and the networks to which the client is currently connected, Applicants' "redirection web site" actually sets the client browser's home page to the home page identifier that was retrieved by the redirection web site and redirects the browser that is executing on the client computing device to the retrieved home page identifier (see last limitation). Applicants have clarified the claim to include the timestamp and client network information being received from the home page request that is received from the client device. Applicants note that neither Sullivan nor O'Neil teach or suggest including this information in a request that is sent from a client device and received at a redirection web site or by Sullivan's "registry server." This limitation is supported by Applicants specification (see, e.g., Figure 5, element 530 which clearly shows Applicant's redirection web site receiving this information from the client device).

Furthermore, Applicants have added a new limitation of “repeatedly re-performing” the obtaining, retrieval, and redirecting steps on a time-interval basis (see last limitation added to each of claims 1, 8, and 14). This newly added limitation is also supported by Applicants’ specification (see, e.g., Figure 3, element 375 which waits for a time period to elapse before re-performing the aforementioned steps. A careful review of Sullivan reveals that Sullivan never teaches or suggests retrieving home page information on a time-interval basis. Instead, Sullivan teaches retrieving a current record for the device one time and does not teach re-performing the operation on a time-interval basis (see, e.g., Sullivan’s Figure 5 and 6 which only perform step 510 and 610, respectively, a single time). Likewise, O’Neil does not teach or suggest the obtaining, retrieval, or redirecting steps and, therefore, does not teach or suggest repeating any of these steps on a time-interval basis (see, e.g., O’Neil’s Figure 3 which does not show repeating any steps on a time-interval basis).

Applicants maintain that, in contrast to Applicants’ claimed limitations, Sullivan’s “registry server” is a server that hosts a register, which Sullivan describes as having a database structure (see Sullivan at [0025]). Sullivan goes on to describe the “registry server” as “a server capable of providing database services...” that is accessible over a computer network (see Sullivan at [0038]). Sullivan describes the devices in his system as having operating systems that “may use the registry 200 to store and access personal preferences for its operation.” (Sullivan at [0038]). Therefore, as described by Sullivan, the “registry server” is simply a remote registry (e.g., a database server) that does not perform any “redirecting” as taught and claimed by Applicants. Furthermore, Sullivan describes the devices that can use the “registry server” as “including an operating system that may use the registry...” (Sullivan at [0038]). In other words, the client computing devices that are used in Sullivan’s system must have a level of sophistication to retrieve information from the registry server using the device’s operating system. In contrast, Applicants’ redirection server looks up the home page identifier and redirects the client computing device to the identified home page without requiring the client computing device to include or execute an operating system that is

capable of retrieving data from a remote database and processing the data in order to determine the home page that the client computing device should use based upon the device's network connection and the current time of day (timestamp).

The Final Office Action admits that Sullivan does not teach redirecting the client computing device to a retrieved web page (Final Office Action, page 5, lines 3-5). However, the Final Office Action contends that O'Neil teaches "a redirection response from a redirection server to a client device; the redirection response redirects client's browser to retrieve a web page corresponding to a redirected URL in the response" (citing col. 6, lines 48-52 of O'Neil). O'Neil teaches "The agent servlet 330 may, if desired, also return an HTTP "redirect" response to the Web browser 120. The redirect response may direct the Web browser 120 to retrieve a Web page associated with a URL that identifies the new .html file 510." Applicants respectfully note that O'Neil does not teach redirecting the client device to a retrieved home page identifier. Instead, O'Neil teaches that Java code can be placed inside of a .html file that causes dynamic generation of a Web page with which the user interacts and does not teach or suggest redirecting a client device to an existing URL, especially a URL that corresponds to a home page identifier.

Applicants maintain that the art of record falls short of teaching or suggesting each of Applicants' claim limitations. Addressing the individual limitations of the independent claim, the Office Action contends that Sullivan teaches "*receiving, over a computer network, at a redirection web site, a home page request from the client computing device, the home page request including a user identifier that identifies a user of the client device, wherein the redirection web site performs the steps including:*" by stating that Sullivan teaches a client browser looking up a home page in a registry server (citing paragraph [0032], lines 3-5 of Sullivan), and further contends that "the home page request including a user identifier that identifies a user of the client device (citing fig. 1, user ID, of Sullivan). First, the Office Action does not even contend that either reference (Sullivan or O'Neil) teach or suggest *receiving, over a computer*

network, at a redirection web site, a home page request. Instead, the Office Action merely points to a small section of Sullivan that reads:

When the user turns on his/her PDA and accesses his/her web browser, the browser looks up the default home page in the registry 200 so as to display the preferred web site (e.g., the Gateway home page, "www.gateway.com"), which was previously set by the application or user for situations in which the user was located in his/her work parking lot.

Applicants respectfully point out that neither Sullivan (in the cited section or elsewhere) nor O'Neil, alone or in combination with one another teach "receiving ... at a redirection web site, a home page request..." Sullivan teaches a "registry" that is a database that stores "preference data." ([0027], lines 1-2). While Sullivan's registry may be stored on a web server, the selection of a record within the registry is performed by the client device as Sullivan does not teach or suggest redirecting the client to a particular home page by a redirection server. This is important as Sullivan teaches a "personal storage area (PSA)" that is accessed by a client device using Application Programming Interfaces (APIs) (see Sullivan, [0046]). In particular, Sullivan teaches a "SetData" API and a "GetData" API that are used, respectively, to store data in the registry and retrieve such data. While API calls may be performed by more advanced devices, such as personal computers and personal digital assistants (PDAs) that include processors and an operating system, such API calls are not available to less sophisticated devices such as mobile telephones, and, in many cases, are only available to devices running particular operating systems that are compatible with making such API calls. In contrast, Applicants' "redirection web site" can redirect a client device to a predefined home page (based on parameters) regardless of the sophistication or operating system being used by the client device.

Finally, the Office Action admits that Sullivan does not teach the last limitation found in each of Applicants' independent claims. In the last paragraph page 4, the Office Action states:

Sullivan does not explicitly disclose setting a browser's home page to the retrieved home page identifier, wherein the setting of the browser's home page includes redirecting the browser executing on the client computing device to the retrieved home page identifier.

Instead, the Office Action contends that O'Neil teaches this limitation by stating:

However, O'Neil discloses a redirection response from a server to a client device; the redirection response redirects client's browser to retrieve a web page corresponding to a redirected URL in the response (col. 6 lines 48-52).

As discussed above, each of the independent claims (1, 8, and 14), is allowable over Sullivan in view of O'Neil.

Conclusion

As a result of the foregoing, it is asserted by Applicants that the remaining claims in the Application are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request an early allowance of such claims.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the Applicants' attorney listed below if the Examiner believes that such a discussion would be helpful in resolving any remaining questions or issues related to this Application.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Joseph T. Van Leeuwen, Reg. No. 44,383/
Joseph T. Van Leeuwen, Reg. No. 44,383
Van Leeuwen & Van Leeuwen
Attorneys for Applicant
Telephone: (512) 301-6738
Facsimile: (512) 301-6742